

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MILDRED STRICKLAND,

Petitioner,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Respondent.

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 15-3714

ORDER

AND NOW, this 7th day of September, 2016, upon review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Carol Sandra Moore Wells (ECF No. 21) and no objections having been filed, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**; ¹
2. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DENIED**, without an evidentiary hearing;
3. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability.²

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Gerald J. Pappert
GERALD J. PAPPERT, J.

¹ Local Rule of Civil Procedure 72.1(IV)(b) and 28 U.S.C. Section 636(b)(1) provide that any party may, within 14 days, file written objections to a Report and Recommendation (“R & R”). The Court reviews *de novo* those portions of the R & R to which there are objections. *See Phelps v. Colvin*, No. 13-cv-5338, 2015 WL 9192290, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 17, 2015). Where no objections are made, the court should, as a matter of good practice, “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b) advisory committee notes. On August 19, 2016 Magistrate Judge Wells issued a report and recommendation that the Court dismiss Petitioner’s writ of habeas corpus without an evidentiary hearing. (ECF No. 21.) Petitioner failed to object to Judge Wells’s R & R. The Court has reviewed the record to confirm that there is no clear error and accordingly accepts the recommendation.

² Reasonable jurists would not debate the Court’s disposition of petitioner’s claims. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).